DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 271 612 CE 044 724

TITLE Youth Employment Today: Invest Now or Pay Later. A First Friday Report.
INSTITUTION National Committee for Full Employment, Washington, DC.; Service America: The Roosevelt Project, Washington, DC.
PUB DATE 3 Jul 86
NOTE 27p.
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Statistical Data (110)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adolescents; Black Employment; Black Youth; Demography; Economically Disadvantaged; Educational Attainment; *Educational Needs; *Educational Policy; Education Work Relationship; Employment Opportunities; *Employment Patterns; *Employment Problems; Hispanic Americans; Labor Market; Minority Groups; Policy Formation; Poverty; Salary Wage Differentials; Secondary Education; Socioeconomic Influences; Socioeconomic Status; *Unemployment; *Youth Employment

ABSTRACT

Although youth between the ages of 16 and 19 account for only 6.7 percent of the nation's labor force, they constitute 17.9 percent of the officially unemployed. Unemployment among youth is rising. More than 46 percent of the nation's black youth and nearly 39 percent of Hispanic children currently live below the poverty level. Moreover, real youth unemployment may be substantially higher inasmuch as the official jobless rate masks the problems of underemployment and persons who have given up searching for a job. A direct correlation exists between family income and the labor force experience of youth. Despite consistent findings that employment experience during high school significantly improves the labor market success of young persons as they move to adulthood, students from poor families have substantially below-average labor force participation rates. Even among dropouts, the correlation between employment status and family income is strong. Policymakers should reinforce the connection between education and employment in every feasible way, including reversing the disinvestment approach of recent years, increasing educational options for potential dropouts, introducing a remediation component into the Summer Youth Program, and establishing school-to-work transition programs in all secondary schools. (Data on real joblessness among states and localities is appended.) (MN)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED271612

A FIRST FRIDAY REPORT

YOUTH EMPLOYMENT TODAY:
INVEST NOW OR PAY LATER

July 3, 1986

Issued by the National Committee for Full Employment and
SERVICE AMERICA: The Roosevelt Project
in conjunction with:

AFL-CIO
Amalgamated Clothing and Textile Workers Union
American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees
American Jewish Congress
American Youth Work Center
Americans for Democratic Action
Center for Community Change
Children's Defense Fund
Coalition on Block Grants and Human Needs
Communications Workers of America
Food and Allied Service Trades Department, AFL-CIO
Friends Committee on National Legislation
Human Environment Center
Industrial Union Department, AFL-CIO
Interfaith Action for Economic Justice
International Union of Operating Engineers
Lutheran Council U.S.A. Office for Governmental Affairs
National Congress for Community Economic Development
National Conference of Catholic Charities
National Council of La Raza
National Farmers Union
National Office for Black Catholics
National Urban League
NETWORK
Presbyterian Church U.S.A.
Roosevelt Centennial Youth Project
Rural Coalition
United Auto Workers
United Church of Christ, Office for Church in Society
United Food and Commercial Workers
United Methodist Church Department of
Social and Economic Justice
General Board of Church and Society
United States Catholic Conference
United States Student Association
United Steelworkers of America
YWCA of the USA, National Board
Wider Opportunities for Women
Workers Defense League, Inc.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
J. Smith
Nat'l Committee for Full Employment
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CE041704

EDITORS/CONTRIBUTORS:

Calvin H. George
National Committee for Full Employment

Frank J. Slobig
SERVICE AMERICA: The Roosevelt Project

Martha Escutia
Margarita Prieto
National Council of La Raza

Andrew Sum
Center for Labor Market Studies
Northeastern University, Boston, MA

Clifford M. Johnson
Childrens' Defense Fund

For further information or additional copies of this report, contact:

National Committee for Full Employment
815 16th Street, N.W.
Suite 301
Washington, D.C. 20006
(202) 393-7415

FIRST FRIDAY REPORT

YOUTH EMPLOYMENT TODAY: INVEST NOW OR PAY LATER

July 3, 1986

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
I.	Introduction.	1
II.	Children in Poverty	2
III.	Change: The Deceptive Demographics	3
IV.	Teen Poverty, School and Employment Problems.	5
	A. A More Comprehensive View of Youth Employment Problems	7
	B. Labor Force Behavior, School Status and the Employment and Earnings of America's Teenagers.	10
V.	Conclusion: Recommended Policy Responses	16
	Appendix: Real Joblessness Among States and Localities	19

YOUTH EMPLOYMENT TODAY: INVEST NOW OR PAY LATER

I. Introduction

With more than 8.4 million Americans unemployed in June, 1986, the nation's official jobless rate remains stuck at more than 7% of the labor force. While a marked improvement over the 10.7% rate in November, 1982 at the low point of the last recession, the official jobless rate masks the economic hardships faced by millions of people who work only part time because they cannot find full-time jobs or who have given up looking for work altogether. When these two groups are included, the National Committee for Full Employment's calculation of the "Real Rate" of joblessness and under-employment stood at 12.7% in June, 1986, or 15.1 million Americans.

Among the hardest hit groups are the nation's teenagers and young adults. While 16 to 19 year olds account for 6.7% of the labor force, they constitute 17.9% of the officially unemployed. This First Friday Report, the 23rd in a series, examines the labor market status of young people and its relationship to poverty and educational preparation. For nearly a quarter of all teenagers across the country one or more significant economic or educational barriers impedes them from moving into a self-fulfilling and self-supporting place in adult society. That percentage is rising and the problems are borne to a disproportionate

degree by young blacks and Hispanics living in central cities and rural poverty areas. The pauperization of our youth population and the inter-relationship between poverty, race, education and employment warrant widespread public awareness and a concerted policy focus.

II. Children in Poverty

Poverty among children has risen sharply in recent years. Between 1969 and 1984 the number of poor children increased from 9.5 million to more than 13 million. Now more than one-fifth of our nation's 62 million children (17 years and younger) live in poverty. More than 46% of black and nearly 39% of Hispanic children are below the poverty level. Hispanic children are poor. Poverty among Hispanic children in particular has increased dramatically in recent years.

Percentage of Children (Ages 0 through 17), in Poverty by Race, 1959-1984

All Families	Hispanic	Black	White	Total
1959	n/a	65.5	20.6	26.9
1969	n/a	39.6	9.7	13.8
1979	27.7	40.8	11.4	16.0
1980	33.0	42.1	13.4	17.9
1981	35.4	44.9	14.7	19.5
1982	38.9	47.3	16.5	21.3
1983	37.7	46.2	17.0	21.8
1984	38.7	46.2	16.1	21.0
% change, 1959-1979	---	-37.7	-44.7	-40.5
% change, 1979-1984	+39.7	+13.2	+41.2	+31.2

Source: National Center for Health Statistics, as cited in A Children's Defense Budget, Childrens Defense Fund, Washington, D.C., 1986.

Percentages and timeframes provide us with a quick sense of the overall trends. Beyond that the stark facts speak for themselves.

Child Poverty in America*

- Thirteen million children in America are poor.
- More than one out of every five children is poor.
- Nearly one out of every four children under six is poor.
- One out of every five children six to seventeen is poor.
- Almost two out of every three poor children are white.
- Nearly half of all black children in America are poor.
- Nearly two out of every five Hispanic children are poor.
- More than half of all children in female-headed families are poor.
- One out of eight children in two-parent families is poor.

III. Change: The Deceptive Demographics

Many labor market economists ten years ago predicted that the decade of the '80's would be a virtual full employment period for young people. It hasn't turned out that way. The teenage population declined by nearly 13% between 1979 and 1985. Instead of an expected increase in the employment of teens, the number working fell by over 20%.

Once again we hear the optimistic futurists forecasting that by the year 2000 the youth labor force will have shrunk by as much as 40%, and that every qualified young person who wants a job will have one, unless the economy stagnates. The composition

---

* A Children's Defense Budget, Childrens Defense Fund, Washington, D.C. 1986.

of the youth population moving into the labor force has undergone dramatic changes in the last 15 years and will continue to do so, as we move into the twenty-first century.

The following figures show the shifts in the size and composition of the youth population since 1970. While the absolute numbers of both black and white teens dropped, the Hispanic teenage population rose significantly by 59%. In the last five years, however, all three younger subgroups declined in numbers with the black and white populations dropping by 27% and 30% respectively. Young Hispanics declined by only slightly more than 3%.

Youth Population by Race
(numbers in 1,000's)

	Hispanic		Black		White			
15-19	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Total	%
1970	977	(4.9)	2,423	(12.3)	16,370	(82.8)	19,771	(100%)
1975	1,511	(6.8)	2,868	(12.8)	17,993	(80.4)	22,372	(100%)
1980	1,606	(7.5)	2,985	(13.8)	16,962	(78.7)	21,553	(100%)
1985	1,554	(9.9%)	2,175	(13.9)	11,948	(76.2)	15,677	(100%)
20-24								
1970	817	(4.8)	1,814	(9.3)	14,282	(85.9)	16,913	(100%)
1975	991	(5.0)	2,346	(11.8)	16,618	(83.2)	19,957	(100%)
1980	1,586	(7.3)	2,725	(12.6)	17,289	(81.1)	21,599	(100%)
1985	1,767	(8.2)	2,694	(12.5)	17,172	(79.3)	21,633	(100%)

Source: Bureau of the Census, 1986.

In the young adult 20-24 year age range all groups rose over the 15 year period as the tailend of the baby boom moved into adulthood. Between 1980 and 1985 blacks and whites declined slightly, but Hispanics continued to rise. The fifteen year rise between 1970 and 1985 in the Hispanic young adult population was meteoric, up by 116%.

Hispanic Americans are the nation's youngest and fastest growing population subgroup. The median age of Hispanics is 25.0

compared to 31.4 for the overall population. Nearly 47% of Hispanics are 21 years old or younger. This relative youthfulness alone assures large cohorts of Hispanic youth for years to come. But it should also be noted that the fertility rate of Hispanic women 18-44 years old is significantly higher than blacks and whites. The high Hispanic fertility rate, though declining, is well above "replacement" levels. The sharply increasing proportion of the total youth population that is Hispanic needs to be acknowledged and addressed in a systematic and effective fashion.

Fertility Rates: Women 18-44 Years Old
(Births per 1,000 women)

	1980	1984
Overall	71.7	65.8
White Women	68.5	64.6
Black Women	84.0	72.2
Hispanic Women	106.5	86.1

Source: Hispanics in the Work Force: Hispanic Youth, National Council of La Raza, Washington, D.C., 1986.

It is in the context of this pattern of increasing poverty and rapidly changing demographics that the labor market experience and basic skills preparation of youth need to be examined.

IV. Teen Poverty, School and Employment Problems

Between March 1981 and March 1985 the 16-19 year old, civilian, non-institutional population dropped by nearly 11%. Yet the absolute number of poor teens increased by nearly 375,000 or 15% in four years. By March of 1985 20% of our nation's teenagers were living in poverty and nearly 29% were living in poor or near poor families. These increases in low income status occurred among all race/ethnic subgroups.

The Distribution of 16-19 Year Olds Living in Poverty Families, by Race/Ethnic Group, U.S.: March 1981 and March 1985

Race/Ethnic Group	(A) March 1981	(B) March 1985	(C) Absolute Change	(D) Percent Change
All	2,447.8	2,821.3	+373.5	+15.3%
White, non-Hispanic	1,228.7	1,384.8	+156.1	+12.7%
Black, non-Hispanic	792.9	883.7	+90.8	+11.5%
Hispanic	331.1	442.2	+111.1	+33.6%
Other, non-Hispanic	95.2	110.6	+15.4	+16.2%

Source: As cited in One-Fifth of the Nation's Teenagers: Employment Problems of Poor Youth in America, 1981-1985, Andrew M. Sum, April, 1986.

Young blacks and Hispanics have a significantly higher incidence of poverty than whites. The sharper rate of increase among Hispanics is consistent with the population growth cited earlier. It should be noted, however, that the largest absolute increase in poverty was among white teens.

These poor young people are moving through adolescence into young adulthood in an extremely precarious economic situation; for them poverty is the single most serious impediment to a successful transition into productive adulthood. A high percentage of these more than 4 million poor and near poor teens are likely to experience substantial difficulties entering and adjusting to the labor market. They are clearly at great risk of becoming the adult poor of the 1990's and the "dependent poor" of the twenty-first century.

Presently we are failing to provide these young people with the educational preparation, the skills training and the opportunities to work to support themselves or to help support their families. General economic growth since the 1981-1982 recession

has not generated sufficient employment opportunities to meet the demands of young people seeking work. High levels of official youth unemployment prevail. In fact, much lower labor force participation rates than forecasted have kept the teen unemployment rates from soaring even higher.

The decade of the 1980's was expected by many forecasters in the 1970's to be a golden age of opportunity for youth. The rapid expansion of opportunities in the late 1970's pushed the teen employment/population ratio to an all time high of 49.1% in the first quarter of 1979. The subsequent decline of federal employment and training resources for youth, coupled with the disastrous recession resulted in a sharp increase in the unemployment rate, a sizable drop in the percentage of young people in the labor force and a sharp decline in the percentage of young people actually working. To date, recovery for teenagers has been elusive.

The table on page 7 shows the patterns that have occurred since 1979. Despite the seemingly apparent strong growth in employment opportunities for the population overall, teens did not improve their employment situation sufficiently to regain the peak levels of 1979. Improvements occurred for all teens in 1985 but have flattened out over the last year, as has the recovery in general. Young whites, blacks and Hispanics all have present employment levels markedly below those of early 1979. Presently only 1 in 4 black teens is employed, compared to 1 in 2 white teens and less than 1 in 3 Hispanics.

A. <u>A More Comprehensive View of Youth Employment Problems</u>

Rather than simply identifying numbers of <u>unemployed youth</u>, we can take a somewhat more comprehensive view of the youth employment problem by also examining how many youths want to be employed, but are not actively seeking work, and how many are employed part-time who wish to be employed on a full-time basis. The table on page 8 presents data on the combined absolute and relative numbers of teens who were unemployed, desiring employment but not actively seeking work, or employed part-time

Civilian Labor Force Status of
16-19 Year Olds (Both Sexes, All Races)
in the U.S., 1979 I to 1985 I
(Seasonally Adjusted Data, in %)

Time Period	(A) Civilian Labor Force Participation Rate	(B) Unemployment Rate	(C) Employment/ Population Ratio
1979 I	58.4	16.0	49.1
1982 III	53.8	23.7	41.0
1985 I	55.2	18.5	45.0
1979 I to 1982 III	-4.6 (-7.9%)	+7.7 (+48.1%)	-8.1 (-16.5%)
1982 III to 1985 I	+1.4 (2.6%)	-5.2 (21.9%)	+4.0 (+9.8%)
1979 I to 1985 I	-3.2 (-5.5%)	+2.5 (+15.6%)	-4.1 (-8.4%)

Sources: Sum, A., idem.

(1) U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Labor Force Statistics Derived from the Current Population Survey: A Databook, Volume II, Bulletin 2096;

(2) U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Employment and Earnings, July, 1985;

(3) U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Employment and Earnings, January 1986.

involuntarily during the first quarters of calendar years 1979, 1982, and 1985. It should be noted that these three statuses are mutually exclusive, i.e., an individual can only appear in one of these three problem groups.

During the first quarter of calendar year 1979, approximately 3.3 million teenagers (16-19) experienced one of the three labor market problems described above. These three groups

Labor Force and Employment Problems of
16-19 Year Old Youth (Both Sexes, All Races)
in the U.S., 1979 I to 1985 I
(Not Seasonally Adjusted)

Labor Force Group	(A) 1979 I	(B) 1982 I	(C) 1985 I
(1) Civilian Labor Force	8,837	7,864	7,312
(2) Want a Job But Not Actively Looking	1,401	1,774	1,377
(3) Adjusted Labor Force (1 + 2)	10,238	9,638	8,689
(4) Unemployed	1,493	1,848	1,414
(5) Employed Part-time for Economic Reasons	399	543	501
(6) All Problems (2 + 4 + 5)	3,293	4,165	3,293
(7) All Problems as a % of Adjusted Labor Force (3)	32.2%	43.2%	37.9%

Sources: Sum, A., idem.

(1) U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Employment and Earnings, Feb.-April 1979, Feb.-April 1982, Feb.-April 1985.

combined accounted for 32.2% of the "adjusted" teen labor force. By the first quarter of calendar year 1982, the absolute number of teens encountering one of these three problems rose to a level of 4.2 million and accounted for 43% of the adjusted teen labor force. During the first quarter of calendar year 1985, the total number of teens experiencing one of the above three employment problems fell back to its 1979 level of 3.3 million. However, the adjusted teen labor force had shrunk by nearly 1.6 million or 15% during the six year period, due to a declining teen population and reduced participation rates. As a result, approximately 38% of all teens in the adjusted labor force were experiencing an employment problem during the first quarter of calendar year 1985. This ratio is 5 percentage points below that prevailing during early 1982, but also remains nearly 6 percentage points above that of early 1979.

Using this more comprehensive measure of youth employment problems, we can see that American teens in the aggregate have

improved their labor force position in recent years, but not at a pace sufficiently rapid to restore them to their early 1979 employment situation. The shift to a "promised land" in the labor market for teenagers clearly has not taken place despite the continued fall in their numbers. Youth from poor and near poor families and from many minority families continue to fare quite poorly in the labor market at mid-decade.

B. Labor Force Behavior, School Status and the Employment and Earnings of America's Teenagers

A direct correlation exists between family income and the labor force experience of young people. The poorer teens are less likely to even participate in the labor force. They have significantly higher rates of unemployment and a smaller percentage is employed. Those teens most in need of employment experi-

The Civilian Labor Force Status of All 16-19 Year Olds (Both Sexes, All Races) At the Time of the March 1985 CPS Interview, by Size of Family Income Relative to the Official Poverty Line (N = 14.6 Million)

Family Income Group	(A) Percent in Civilian Labor Force	(B) Unemployment Rate	(C) Percent Employed
Below Poverty Line	39.2%	33.4%	26.1%
1.00-1.49 Times Poverty Line	49.6%	24.8%	37.3%
1.50-1.99 Times Poverty Line	50.0%	18.2%	40.9%
2.00-2.99 Times Poverty Line	55.6%	17.4%	45.8%
3.00 Times Poverty Line and Above	55.4%	13.7%	47.9%
All (Average)	51.3%	18.8%	44.6%

Sources: Sum, A., idem.

ence were least likely to be receiving it. Only 26% of all poor teens were employed at the time the Andrew Sum analysis was done.

The analysis further reveals that the employment/population ratio of American teens varies sharply by race/ethnic group and within each race/ethnic group by family income. The data do not support the efforts of some contemporary social scientists to minimize the significance of race. Young blacks from families with incomes three times the poverty line still have a lower employment/population ratio (32.8%) than young whites from families living below the poverty line (34.3%). Poor black teens have by far the most severe employment problems with only 14% employed.

The Employment/Population Ratios of Selected Subgroups of 16-19 Year Olds (Both Sexes) At the Time of the March 1985 CPS Interview, by Race/Ethnic Group and Size of Family Income Relative to Official Poverty Line

	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)
Family Income Group	White, non Hispanic	Black, non Hispanic	Hispanic	Black as % of White	Hispanic as % of White
All	46.8%	22.4%	35.1%	47.8%	75.0%
Below Poverty Line	34.3%	14.0%	26.0%	40.8%	75.8%
3.00 Times Poverty Line and Above	49.4%	32.8%	44.9%	66.4%	90.9%
Below Poverty Line as % of 3.00 Times Poverty Line and Above	69.4%	42.7%	57.9%	61.5%	83.4%

Sources: Sum, A., idem.

The duration of employment and the weekly earnings of employed youth vary directly and consistently with the size of family income. Poor youth worked less than 9 weeks and when they

did work they received the lowest weekly earnings. Given the reliance by poor youth on the Summer Youth Employment Program (SYEP), it would appear that for many poor teens the wages from

Mean Weeks of Employment, Mean Annual Earnings, and Mean Weekly Earnings of All 16-19 Year Olds (Both Sexes, All Races) During Calendar Year 1984 by Size of Family Income Relative to Poverty Line, U.S.

Family Income	(A) Mean Weeks of Employment	(B) Mean Earnings	(C) Mean Earnings Per Week of Employment
Below Poverty Line	8.9	$617	$69
1.00-1.49 Times Poverty Line	14.7	$1397	$95
1.50-1.99 Times Poverty Line	16.1	$1688	$105
2.00-2.99 Times Poverty Line	17.7	$1701	$97
3.00 Times Poverty Line and Above	20.0	$2138	$107
Total (Average)	16.5	$1646	$100

Sources: Sum, A., idem.

SYEP jobs may be their only source of income. Thus, employment programs for disadvantaged youth can contribute to anti-poverty goals for poor families.

High School Students

A cumulative body of youth employment research has consistently revealed that employment experience during high school significantly improves the labor market success of young persons as they move into adulthood. Yet the data show that students from poor families have a substantially below average labor force participation rate (21.9%) and relatively high unemployment rate

(39%). The percentage of the population employed (13.3%) is extremely low. Once again, these youth from low income families who are most in need of early work experience are least likely to receive it during their high school years. Only 6% of poor black students were employed in March 1985.

High School Dropouts

Similar to the findings on high school students, the labor force behavior of young high school dropouts is consistently and strongly associated with the relative income position of their

Civilian Labor Force Participation Rates, Unemployment Rates, and Employment/Population Ratios of Selected Subgroups of 16-19 Year Old High School Dropouts (Both Sexes, All Races), U.S.: March 1981, March 1984, and March 1985

Labor Force Measure/ Youth Subgroup	(A) March 1981	(B) March 1984	(C) March 1985
Civilian Labor Force Participation Rate			
o Poor Dropouts	54.0%	53.2%	54.7%
o Dropouts in Families With Incomes 3 Times Poverty Line	84.3%	80.8%	83.2%
o Relative Ratio	1.56*	1.52*	1.52*
Unemployment Rate			
o Poor Dropouts	46.3%	46.3%	41.4%
o Dropouts in Families With Incomes 3 Times Poverty Line	16.3%	13.8%	10.5%
o Relative Ratio	.35*	.30*	.25*
Employment/ Population Ratio			
o Poor Dropouts	29.0%	28.5%	32.0%
o Dropouts in Families With Incomes 3 Times Poverty Line	70.6%	69.6%	74.5%
o Relative Ratio	2.43*	2.44*	2.33*

Sources: Sum, A., idem.

families. Dropouts from poor families had significantly lower labor force participation rates and employment/population ratios than more affluent dropouts. The unemployment rate of poor dropouts in March 1985 (41.4%) was nearly four times what it was for more advantaged early school leavers (10.5%). The labor market problems of poor female dropouts are particularly acute. Their labor force participation rate is below 39%, less than half that of their more economically advantaged counterparts. Their unemployment rate is fully six times greater (46.3%) than that of young women from more affluent families who have dropped out (7.7%).

Civilian Labor Force Participation Rates, Unemployment Rates, and Employment/Population Ratios of Female 16-19 Year Old High School Dropouts, by Size of Family Income Relative to Poverty Line, U.S.: March 1985

Family Income	(A) Civilian Labor Force Participation Rate	(B) Unemployment Rate	(C) Employment/ Population Ratio
Below Poverty Line	38.9%	46.3%	20.8%
1.00-1.49 Times Poverty Line	58.5%	24.7%	44.1%
1.50-1.99 Times Poverty Line	63.1%	26.8%	46.2%
2.00-2.99 Times Poverty Line	72.6%	12.0%	63.9%
3.00 Times Poverty Line and Above	79.3%	7.7%	73.2%
All (Average)	58.7%	22.4%	45.5%

Sources: Sum, A., idem.

Labor Force Status of High School Graduates Not Enrolled Full Time in Post-Secondary Schools

Finally, data on high school graduates not attending post-secondary school full time show similar relative disparities between poor and non-poor youths. But they also show that the completion of high school substantively enhances the ability of poor teenagers to obtain employment.

Civilian Labor Force Participation Rates, Unemployment Rates, and Employment/Population Ratios of Selected Subgroups of 16-19 Year Old Non-Enrolled High School Graduates (Both Sexes, All Races), U.S.: March 1981, March 1984, and March 1985 (in %)

Labor Force Measure/ Youth Subgroup	(A) March 1981	(B) March 1984	(C) March 1985
Civilian Labor Force Participation Rate			
o Poor Graduates	76.8%	76.4%	74.9%
o Graduates in Families With Incomes 3 Times Poverty Line and Above	92.0%	89.7%	88.9%
o Relative Ratio	1.20*	1.18*	1.19*
Unemployment Rate			
o Poor Graduates	29.2%	34.0%	20.4%
o Graduates in Families With Incomes 3 Times Poverty Line and Above	11.0%	8.8%	9.9%
o Relative Ratio	.38*	.26*	.48*
Employment/ Population Ratio			
o Poor Graduates	54.3%	50.4%	59.7%
o Graduates in Families With Incomes 3 Times Poverty Line and Above	81.9%	81.8%	80.0%
o Relative Ratio	1.51*	1.62*	1.34*

Sources: Sum, A., idem.

A distinct comparative advantage exists, however, for poor white graduates over their black and Hispanic counterparts. Only 43% of poor black high school graduates were employed in March 1985. Moreover, young Hispanic graduates have actually lost ground over the last five years.

Employment/Population Ratios of Poor 16-19 Year Old High School Graduates, Not Enrolled in Post-Secondary School by Race/Ethnic Group, U.S.: March 1981, March 1984, and March 1985

	(A)	(B)	(C)
Time Period	Poor White non-Hispanics	Poor Black non-Hispanics	Poor Hispanics
March 1981	59.2	38.1	62.7
March 1984	58.7	29.1	54.8
March 1985	66.0	43.0	58.4
1985 as % of 1981	111.4	112.9	93.1

Sources: Sum, A., idem.

V. Conclusion: Recommended Policy Response

The data provided in this report demonstrate dramatically that the need for a national policy response to the problem of pervasive youth joblessness is greater now than at the beginning of the decade. We are failing as a nation to provide many poor and minority youths with the basic preparation for work or the opportunities to do so. The nation can ill afford to neglect the educational and employment deficiencies of its teenage poverty population. The potential costs and risk of such neglect are enormous. By 1992, each older American receiving social security benefits will be supported by only three workers (compared to seventeen in 1950), one of whom will be a minority worker.

The future economic growth and well-being of our nation will depend increasingly on the skills and capability of a workforce

undergoing rapid demographic change. The success of future efforts to strengthen family life and eradicate poverty will depend on our ability to improve the employability and earnings of young people moving into the adult labor force. The quality of life of all Americans, regardless of age or race, would clearly be enhanced by a more capable, productive, young workforce.

For most poor young people the public school system provides much of the basic formation required to transition into the work world. The quality of that schooling varies considerably with children from more affluent areas being far more likely to get a solid early preparation. A sustained and publicly supported commitment to equal educational opportunity is critical to assure that the less fortunate are not left behind. Funding should be increased for programs of proven effectiveness, such as Chapter 1 for elementary students and it should be expanded into middle schools.

The connection between education and employment should be reinforced in every feasible way.

- By reversing the disinvestment approach of recent years that has resulted in substantial cuts in human resource development programs and increasing the commitment to Job Corps and the Summer Youth Employment Program.
- By establishing a "stay-in-school" program that provides work or service opportunities, that are educationally conditioned.
- By increasing educational options for potential dropouts and early school leavers through the creation of alternative schools and community learning centers.
- By emphasizing basic skills development in both the formal school setting and in our second chance programs, particularly the Job Training Partnership Act.
- By introducing a remediation component into the Summer Youth Program.
- By establishing school-to-work transition programs in all secondary schools.

To help implement these measures we advocate the development of a nationwide Educational Service Corps that would involve young adults working in a concerted fashion, preferably on a full-time basis, to address the distinct needs of at-risk students. Developed in states and localities across the country, such a mission-oriented approach would enlist young Americans of diverse ethnic, geographic, racial and economic backgrounds and channel their energy, enthusiasm and commitment into addressing an area of need critical to the health and well being of our future society.

This month we celebrate the 10th anniversary of the California Conservation Corps. Nearly 30,000 young people have contributed a portion of their youthful lifetime in assuring a better environment in that state. Now two dozen other states and localities have similar year round corps. We challenge state and local governments to develop appropriate public/private partnerships to mount a parallel crusade in addressing the educational and economic crisis that confronts so many of our youngsters today. Ten years from now, perhaps, we can celebrate the anniversary of another pace setting program that has led the way.

Appendix: Real Joblessness Among States and Localities

The economic, social and human costs of joblessness continue to be felt throughout America. While a few areas of the country, principally the northeast, have healthier economic pictures than they did at the end of the 1970s, most areas have worse jobless rates -- official and "real" -- than before the recessions of 1980 and 1982. NCFE's "real jobless rate" takes into account "discouraged" and involuntary part-timers that the official unemployment rate omits. Tables 2 and 3 provide detailed information on the official and real jobless rates for all states, the largest metropolitan areas, and the hardest hit communities. Among other things, these tables reveal the following:

-- 39 states had higher real jobless rates in April, 1986, than in 1979.

-- State jobless rates range from a low of 3.4 percent official and 6.4 percent "real" for New Hampshire to 13.2 percent official and 23.8 percent "real" for Louisiana.

-- Six states have official jobless rates in the double digit range; five have "real" jobless rates above 18 percent.

-- The large metropolitan areas with the highest jobless rates were Houston (9.0 percent official; 16.2 percent "real"), Pittsburgh (8.0 percent official; 14.4 percent "real"), and Detroit (8.3 percent official; 14.9 percent "real").

-- The communities ranking in the top 20 worst jobless rates are spread over 10 states, cover every region, and are all worse off than they were in 1979.

-- Jobless rates for the hardest hit communities range from 10.4 percent to 17.7 percent official and 18.7 percent to 31.9 percent "real".

-- Among communities showing the biggest increases in real joblessness between 1979 and April, 1986, are Waterloo-Cedar Falls, IA (a 190 percent jump); Kenosha, WI (a 174 percent jump) and Lafayette, LA (a 159 percent jump).

TABLE 1

TWENTY HIGHEST METROPOLITAN AREAS UNEMPLOYMENT (%)

	Location	Annual Average 1979 Official Rate	Annual Average 1979 Real Rate	April 1986 (most recent) Official* Rate	April 1986 (most recent) Real** Rate
1.	McAllen Edinburg Mission, TX	12.0	20.4	17.7	31.9
2.	Modesto CA	11.9	20.1	16.4	29 5
	Houma Thibodaux, LA	N/A	N/A	16.4	29.5
3.	Lake Charles, LA	6.8	11 6	15.5	27.9
4.	Brownsville Harlingen, TX	8 5	14 5	14 9	26.8
5.	Beaumont-Port Arthur, TX	5.9	10.0	14 4	25 9
	Fresno, CA	8.0	13.6	14.4	25.9
6.	Stockton, CA	9.9	16.8	12.8	23 0
7.	Beaver County, PA	N/A	N/A	12.7	22 9
	Bakersfield CA	8.6	14.6	12.7	22.9
	Lafayette, LA	4.7	8.0	12.7	22 9
8.	Owensboro, KT	5.7	9.7	12 6	22 7
9.	Shreveport, LA	6.1	10.4	12.5	22.5
	Waterloo-Cedar Falls, IA	4.7	8.5	12 5	22 5
	Kenosha, WI	5.2	8.8	12.5	22.5
10.	Longview Marshall, TX	N/A	N/A	11.8	21.2
11.	Johnstown PA	8.7	14 8	11.5	20 7
12.	Odessa, TX	N/A	N/A	11.4	20.5
	Baton Rouge, LA	6.5	11.1	11.4	20.5
13.	Wheeling WV	6.4	10.9	11.3	20.3
14.	Salinas-Seaside Monterey CA	8.1	13.8	11.2	20 2
15.	Decatur, IL	7.9	14.2	11.1	20 0
	New Orleans, LA	5.8	9.9	11 1	20.0
16.	Kankakee, IL	8.1	13.8	11.0	19.8
	El Paso, TX	7 9	13.4	11.0	19.8
17.	Parkersburg-Marietta WV	6 4	10.2	10.8	19 4
18.	Galveston Texas City, TX	5.0	8.5	10 7	19.3
	Hunington-Ashland, WV	4.7	8.0	10.7	19 3
19.	Gary Hammond, IN	6.6	11.2	10.6	19 1
20.	Monroe LA	7.4	12.6	10 4	18 7

*/ SOURCE: Bureau of Labor Statistics.

**/Source: Full Employment Action Council. The real rate of unemployment takes into account the numbers of officially unemployed, part-time for economic reasons and discouraged workers. In April , the official unemployment rate was 7.2 percent, while the real jobless rate was 12.7 percent.

TABLE 2

TWENTY LARGEST METROPOLITAN AREAS UNEMPLOYMENT (%)

	Location	Annual Average 1979 Official Rate	Annual Average 1979 Real Rate	April 1986 (most recent) Official* Rate	April 1986 (most recent) Real** Rate
1.	New York, NY	8.1	13.8	7.8	14.0
2.	Los Angeles-Long Beach, CA	5.5	9.4	5.8	10 4
3.	Chicago, Il	5.2	8.8	7.5	13.5
4.	Philadelphia, PA	6.9	11.7	5.1	19.2
5.	San Francisco, CA	5.6	9.5	4.6	8.3
6	Detroit, MI	8.0	13.6	8.3	14.9
7.	Boston, MA	5.3	9.0	3.3	5.9
8.	Houston,TX	3.3	5.6	9.0	16.2
9.	Washington, D.C.	7.5	12.8	6.5	11.7
10.	Dallas, TX	3.6	6.1	5.2	9.4
11.	Miami-Hialeah, FL	6.3	10 7	6.7	12.0
12.	Cleveland, OH	5.0	8.5	7.3	13.1
13.	St. Louis, MO	5.4	9.2	6.1	11.0
14.	Atlanta, GA	4.6	7.8	4.3	7.7
15.	Pittsburgh, PA	5.9	10.0	8.0	14.4
16.	Baltimore, MD	6.6	11.2	4.7	8.5
17.	Minneapolis-St. Paul, MN	3.3	5.6	4.7	8.5
18.	Seattle, WA	5.3	9.0	6.1	11.0
19.	San Diego, CA	6.2	10.5	5.0	9.0
20.	Tampa-St. Petersburg-Clearwater, FL	5 4	9.2	5.0	9.0

*/Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics.

**/Source: Full Employment Action Council. The real rate of unemployment takes into account the numbers of officially unemployed, part-time for economic reasons and discouraged workers. In April , the official unemployment rate was 7.2 percent, while the real jobless rate was 12.7 percent.

TABLE 3

STATE UNEMPLOYMENT RATES %

State	Annual Average 1979		April 1986 (Most Recent)	
	Official Rate	Real Rate	Official* Rate	Real** Rate
Alabama	7.1	12.1	9.0	16.2
Alaska	9.2	15.6	11.4	20.5
Arizona	5.1	8.8	6.4	11.5
Arkansas	6.2	10.5	8.2	14.8
California	6.2	10.5	6.7	12.0
Colorado	4.8	8.2	N/A	N/A
Connecticut	5.1	8.7	3.6	6.5
Delaware	8.0	13.6	5.1	9.2
District of Columbia	7.5	12.8	6.5	11.7
Florida	6.0	10.2	5.4	9.7
Georgia	5.1	8.7	5.5	9.9
Hawaii	6.3	10.7	5.9	10.6
Idaho	5.7	9.7	9.0	16.2
Illinois	5.5	9.4	8.2	14.8
Indiana	6.4	10.9	6.7	12.0
Iowa	4.1	7.0	7.4	13.3
Kansas	3.4	5.8	5.2	9.4
Kentucky	5.6	9.5	10.0	18.0
Louisiana	6.7	11.4	13.2	23.8
Maine	7.2	12.2	6.3	11.3
Maryland	5.9	10.0	4.0	7.2
Massachusetts	5.5	9.4	3.8	6.8
Michigan	7 8	13.5	9.1	16.4
Minnesota	4.2	7.1	6.2	11.2
Mississippi	5.8	9.9	10.9	19.6
Missouri	4.5	7.7	5.3	9.5
Montana	5.1	8.7	8.3	14.9
Nebraska	3.2	5.4	5.2	9.4
Nevada	5.1	8.7	6.6	11.9
New Hampshire	3.1	5.3	3.4	6.1
New Jersey	6.9	11.7	4.7	8.5
New Mexico	6.6	11.2	9.1	16.4
New York	7.1	12.1	6.7	12.1
North Carolina	4.8	8.2	5.1	9.2
North Dakota	3.7	6.3	7.3	13.1
Ohio	5.9	10.0	7.9	14.2
Oklahoma	3.4	5.8	8.1	14.6
Oregon	6.8	11.6	9.6	17.3

TABLE 3
(continued)

STATE UNEMPLOYMENT RATES %

State	Annual Average 1979 Official Rate	Annual Average 1979 Real Rate	April 1986 (Most Recent) Official* Rate	April 1986 (Most Recent) Real** Rate
Pennsylvania	6.9	11.7	7.0	12.6
Rhode Island	6.6	11.2	3.9	7.0
South Carolina	5 0	8.5	6.8	12.2
South Dakota	3.5	5.6	4.1	7.4
Tennessee	5.8	9.9	7.8	14.0
Texas	4.2	7.1	8.2	14.8
Utah	4.3	7.3	5.3	9.5
Vermont	5.1	8.7	5.0	9.0
Virginia	4.7	8.0	5.2	9.4
Washington	6.8	11.6	7.8	14.0
West Virginia	6 7	11.4	10.8	19.4
Wisconsin	4.5	7.7	7.3	13.1
Wyoming	2.8	4.8	10.8	19 4

*/ Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

**/Source: Full Employment Action Council. The real rate of une ıployment takes into account the numbers of officially unemploye part-time for economic reasons and discouraged workers. In April, the official unemployment rate was 7.2 percent, while the real jobless rate was 12.7 percent.